

From: Robert Falsetti
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:20 PM
Subject: NO TO RULE CHANGE!

Stop this offensive and entirely corporate-driven power grab of our ever-dwindling independent media! The people are not asking for this change, the large conglomerates are. You exist on the Commission to protect the people's interests, not the corporations which already have too much power and influence over our daily lives. We do not want or need them to take over our free media. **SAVE OUR FREE & INDEPENDENT MEDIA!**

From: TANEY
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:22 PM
Subject: Comments on Item 1 of FCC's Docket for June 2, 2003

June 1, 2003

Thanks for the opportunity to make comments on this item that will be considered tomorrow as part of a Public Meeting. As noted on FCC's web site and given the heightened security alert, these comments are being transmitted via e-mail for your consideration.

The "SUMMARY" shown on Docket Item's web site states, "The Commission will consider a Report and Order concerning its broadcast and multiple ownership rules."

While it is understandable that this is what the learned staff at FCC wrote on May 23, 2003, it seems strange that the press and media is full of the details of that report and order. It would have been true public access if that Report and Order were also available on this web site for the whole public to review---that would have been true public access in this 21st Century Information Age. In USA, when for a local development/zoning matter, the local staff reports have to be available to the public, then for a matter of such Nationwide Concern to be considered by the FCC (which will have a far-reaching impact for generations to come), why the Staff Report and Order is not available to the public on the web site.

This proves that not only is the public the real loser by not being able to review the Staff Report on this important matter and unable to advise its representatives, i.e., the five FCC Commissioners, but the Commissioners are also deprived of the public opinion. So the FCC Commissioners are urged to make the Report and Order available for Public Review and Comments for a minimum of thirty days prior to voting on this important matter and making a decision.

CC: FCC FCCINFO, FOIA, Webmaster, Campaignlaw

From: edward kurtik
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Media ownership

This is my comments in relation to your meeting to relax the rule of media outlet ownership.

I feel it is in the BEST interest of the country to have different owners in the same market. I feel this way because in the area I reside there were several newspapers and now there is ONE. This leads to printing news that reflects current ownership. When you allow a media company to own ALL of the print, radio and tv in one market you are restricting news and leads to a form of censorship by not expressing ALL views even opposing views.

Thank you

Ed kurtik

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Bob Jacobini
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Consolidation of the media

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

I oppose any further consolidation of the news media. Please consider that you are playing with our democracy when you contribute to the curtailment of a free press. As a long time consumer of the mass media, I can tell you that the quality of our media has drastically deteriorated over the past 35 years. This deterioration has been so severe in recent years that I no longer consider it reliable, and now look to news sources outside the United States for my information.

Sincerely,
Robert Jacobini
137 Jacobini Rd.
Cobden, IL 62920

From: Eric Kees
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:33 PM
Subject: Media-ownership rule changes

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject the media-ownership rule changes proposed by Chairman Powell.

The strongest argument against these changes is Clear Channel Entertainment. Clear Channel Radio controls 1200 stations reaching more than 110 million listeners every week. Clear Channel Radio has been detrimental to the local radio market. Clear Channel moves in, and the local stations die.

However, even more frightening, is their total control of the airwaves. With one memo they can ban any artist that doesn't agree with their political agenda. We saw it this year with the Dixie Chicks. With Clear Channel Radio coordinating pro-war rallies nation wide, this was clearly an overt attempt to punish an artist for exercising her right of free speech.

The proposed rule changes would make it easier for corporations like Clear Channel to completely dominate the market with their propaganda

These rules are not consistent with the FCC's charter. Support freedom of speech and ideas. Reject the proposed rule changes.

Respectfully,

Eric S. Kees
440 Ardmore Ave
Medford, Oregon
541-245-9181

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: doublesnoops
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:46 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Don Almes
Richfield Ohio 44286

From: Michelle Ladd
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:47 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003

Dear Chairman Powell:

Tomorrow's decision will have lasting effects on our democracy. I am writing to encourage the Federal Communications Commission to leave intact the current limitations on media ownership. Already too many media outlets are concentrated in the hands of too few owners.

A democracy requires a diversity of information so its citizens can adequately participate in their government. We have heard that the lowering of ownership "caps" will increase the diversity of information available to the public. But empirical evidence does not support this position; indeed, radio stations sound alike, television stations look alike, internet sites stream alike. The American people deserve media that reflect their diversity and interests. More importantly, they deserve a variety of accurate options through which to get their news.

As you know, the American people are the owners of the airwaves. The agency you lead is charged with protecting this vital public space. I urge you to vote in the service of the American public tomorrow.

Sincerely,

Michelle Ladd

262 W. Sixth Street

Claremont, CA 91711

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, jadelst@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB

From: Walter Morse
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:51 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Honorable Katherine Q Abernathy, Commissioner, FCC

Dear Commissioner Aberntahy;

I'm writing to urge you to opose any changes in FCC rules, apparently being considered on June 2, '03.

Consolidations of public communication, have always led to misinformation being fed the public, and to the development of totalitarian societies--the people loose their fight to an open and free media.

Thank you for consiering my point of view.

waltermorse@earthlink.net

From: Ryan Confer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 4:55 PM
Subject: Questions about media ownership

Ms. Abernathy,

How can the FCC possibly think that easing the media ownership rules is in the public's best interest? I attended the FCC hearing held at Duke University on the proposed changes and heard no support whatsoever from the public. In fact, almost, if not all, speeches and comments made were opposed to it. As I see it, the only entities this change would favor are the media giants that currently exist.

I thought that the purpose of the FCC was to look out for the best interest of the American people, not a few power hungry multi-millionaires or corporations.

Would you please list for me a few of the possible positive outcomes of this proposed change in the media ownership rules? So far, I have heard none.

Sincerely,
Ryan Confer

1203 Chandler Rd
Huntsville, AL 35801

From: s_bburks
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 5:05 PM
Subject: Proposed new rule

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you NOT to adopt proposed new rules that would allow one owner to own both newspapers and broadcast stations in one market. As a retired journalist, I believe the widest possibly variety of news voices is necessary to preserve a free press, an absolute necessity for a democracy.

Susanne Burks
6901 Seminole Rd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
505-884-4812

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: gfg
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:55 AM
Subject: Do not permit greater monopolistic media ownership

Do not permit greater monopolistic media ownership

Gary Gibbons
aalegrias@yahoo.com

From: Eric Grey
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 11:59 AM
Subject: FCC Regulation

Commissioners:

I urge you NOT to weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media

Media ownership would be concentrated among fewer companies, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints would be compromised. Plus, it would likely result in higher costs for businesses that advertise in local media, and those costs would likely be passed onto consumers.

If you fail to heed the massive negative public comments against these rule changes, I assure you that you will pay the political and professional price. Americans understand that the public interest is not being served by deregulation that reduces competition. Being an independent agency does not make you immune to responsibility of serving the public interest.

Sincerely,

Eric Grey
Virginia

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: William Schneider
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:03 PM
Subject: Conolidation of Mass Media

Dear Sir,

You say these rules will make the media more "economically viable". Where is it written that we must adapt the rules to make them more "economically viable". I thought they had to adapt their product to become more economically viable!

Sincerely yours,

Bill Schneider

From: Andy Herschkowitz
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:04 PM
Subject: June 3 vote

Dear Commissioners:

The ultimate marketplace is the marketplace of ideas. The proposed changes to licensing guidelines jeopardizes this market. Please vote against them.

Sincerely,

Dr Andrew Herschkowitz
58-52 251st Street
Little Neck, NY 11362

From: Joe Mangan
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:08 PM
Subject: RE: Foxes managing the Chicken Coop!!!!

Dear sir;

I am a concerned citizen. I watch with amazement as the Chairman dodge question after question on ABC's news show this morning about the changes to the FCC rules regulating ownership of stations. I was also amazed at his adamant statement that the changes were going to be nominal. Another concern lest you forget Mr. Powell the air ways are owned by the American people not some rich, ego and agenda driven station owner.

I'm pretty sure based on the past history that my choices of radio and TV stations; not currently subscribing to cable are going to be minimized. As an example as I drive to Los Angeles, California the type and number of stations has been lowered with the quality of the radio stations going down. There already has been an impact on what is reported in the news, Disney censored an article that Mr. Eisner decided was not in Disney's best interest on TV. If the other stations hadn't covered the articles he decided were not in his companies best interest I wouldn't have known about the material. I have one question Mr. Powell, "Why did you go to the stations and ask them to buy off on this change?" and not the American people. Is it possible that your lining up for your job after you and the commissioners leave office? You had to solicit support as I read it from the small stations to medium stations and was said that resulted in some changing their minds to allow for the change.

I'm pretty sure you like bland uninteresting radio like that put out by the satellite companies but in the shrinking world I like regional quality radio and TV. Not what is being put out by the monopolistic, my way or the no way, vanilla flavorings of the owners. Their attitude is in my way of thinking, "I know what is best for you listeners" agenda.

As fewer owners talking to their friends in government gets smaller and smaller the result is going to be slanted, censored, and minimalist news coverage with result that the regime

in power remains in power. As an example, only after Iraq fell did we learn that President Bush and his advisors have lied to us about Weapons of Mass Destruction and the regime within Iraq. One more salient point every time someone says its in the best interest of me the listening public, I have lost. More news all the time is the result. Another result when is the last time you could tune into a country and western station or classical music station in some areas of the United States, hmmm? I don't listen to these two musical styles often but I want them as choices and I don't want to be listening

Her comes what my brother calls my liberal rant! I have a feeling under the governing of Adolf Hitler's government as time went on and the communications within the country was taken over by the governing board known as the Nazi's the rant, albeit total lies about "the Jewish problem" on radio increased due to Adolf's needs to deal with the issue within his country. Propaganda and one viewpoint editorials are not in the best interest of the American people. You seem to forget slanting the news brings out the fruits and nuts, that bomb the oppositions places of business, churches and homes. Sound familiar, unless I miss my guess, Adolf, Stalin and Lenin had their equivalent FCC people allow for similar reductions of ownership, till the state ended up owning the stations. The question I have is how this differ from what your organization is proposing? Fewer and fewer owners. fewer and fewer points of view, fewer and fewer ideas, and fewer and fewer options the result being NAZI Germany here USA. I don't like the POV (point of view), that I see forthcoming from the TV and radio stations in my area.

I don't the idea that McCarthyism is on the rise. But then again I see the glass as half empty. I am attaching a letter written to the Senators here in California, hopefully it will pass through your virus scanners software.

By the way if you don't see a problem in going to the radio and television owners asking them about, "would you like to bigger", then I have problem with your mind set.

Thanks much;

Joseph M. Mangan
Home: 925 455 6630
Cell: 925 980 3975
Email: jomangan@earthlink.net

jomangan@earthlink.net

From: ELedcpa@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:08 PM
Subject: Your vote

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

Please do not vote to expand the number and type of media organizations one company can own. I believe strongly that our nation needs variety and competition in the media so that Americans can be most broadly informed without bias.

Sincerely yours,

Elaine F. Goldberg
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

From: James Parrish
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:19 PM
Subject: I oppose the proposed FCC regulation changes in media ownership

Dear FCC Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Adelstein, Copps, and Martin:

I'm writing to oppose the FCC's proposed changes in media ownership (all of them).

I'm an independent filmmaker and co-founder of the Richmond Moving Image Co-op, a nonprofit media arts organization. I don't make my living at either of those activities -- I'm making films about my community and family because those are the things that interest me, and our nonprofit has no paid staff, only community volunteers.

But mainly, I come to you as a concerned citizen (not as a consumer as most of those in power continue to refer to the rest of us!) who is concerned about the proposed changes in the FCC regulations regarded media ownership.

I attended and spoke at the FCC's official public hearing in Richmond, VA (where I live) on Feb. 27. While the time for public comments was limited in comparison to the time given to all the experts, I was struck by the fact that no citizen spoke in favor of these changes. The only people who spoke in favor represented the very companies who would benefit from the changes in media ownership.

I don't believe these changes will benefit me or my community in any way at all. (By the way, I'm not talking about some fictional, global village community, but my community in Richmond, VA.) In fact, I believe they (the rule changes) will further limit my options for diverse perspectives, which aren't all that great at the moment anyway! A media system controlled by a hand-full of major corporate conglomerates, which have profit vs. public interest as their primary motivation, is just as limiting and threatening to democracy as a media system completely controlled by the government. Regulation is not the same thing as complete control.

We need more media voices, not fewer.

From what I can tell given the limited media coverage of this issue and my attendance at the Richmond hearing, virtually no citizens are in favor of the changes (I know that you have received an overwhelming email response indicating opposition to these changes), yet it seems like a done deal.

I attended the hearing in Richmond because I have faith in democracy -- that my voice counts for something. Don't disappoint me. Please listen to us, the citizens; don't be seduced by the reasoning of the media companies who pay people to have their voices heard. I urge you to vote as a citizen, but more importantly vote as someone who represents the interests of the citizens of this great country.

Thank you for your time. I anxiously await your decision tomorrow.

James Parrish

P.S. Do you remember the school teacher who spoke so eloquently at the Richmond hearing? I do. I don't remember her name or the details of what she said, but I remember the essence of her comments and they moved me. She's not directly involved in media making like I am. She is a concerned citizen, a teacher, and one of many -- perhaps a majority? -- of people who oppose these changes. You can watch the videotape or read the transcription of her statement if you don't remember. I urge you to do that before you vote -- if you do nothing else. I believe she spoke the truth; a universal truth that represents the sentiments of lots of people.

--

The Richmond Moving Image Co-op, home of Flicker and the James River Film Festival, is a nonprofit organization that supports independent media arts. To make a tax-deductible donation or for more information contact: RMIC, P.O. Box 7469, Richmond, VA 23221, (804) 355-1383, www.rmicweb.org.

From: Robert Bourque
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:20 PM
Subject: Media ownership

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I urge you not to weaken the rules that help preserve media competition and diversity.

Current TV and radio is already so bland and predictable that I find corporate annual reports more thought-provoking. Don't make it worse.

I for one have already cancelled my cable TV subscription because the offerings are so poor. I find I can get more from alternative and international news off the Internet. So this monopolization of the media will likely drive people away, resulting in a net loss to those corporations who want it all. The reason there are so many different brands of inexpensive cereal on the shelves is that there are so many brands. Just a few and the products would be bad and expensive. That's already happening with the media.

With so many channels available, why is there so little diversity? When was the last time an opera was televised? Or a good play? Unless a portion of these channels are devoted to selected tastes that don't have mass appeal, the FCC isn't doing its job. Don't tell me that the History Channel (some call it the "Hitler Channel") is enough, even though it is good.

Your statement that "The free market is my religion" is scary. Not only does it raise church/state questions, but fails to realize that corporate greed, which will never go away, can only be curbed by the government.

So please re-instate, and even expand, your media ownership diversity rules for the sake of competition and democracy.

Thank you,

Robert Bourque

Dr. Robert F. Bourque
1420 Sioux
Los Alamos, NM 87544
505 662 2469

From: rachel schultz
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:21 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003

Dear Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy:

As a grandmother and a woman, I appeal to you to consider carefully your vote on June 2. I understand you care about children's programming. The overwhelming evidence is that children's programming suffers when stations are owned by fewer owners. Mr. Murdoch didn't even know (or claimed ignorance) when confronted by a questioner about the cancelling of an awarding winning local children's program, after he had acquired the local station into his large holdings. And as a woman concerned about our issues, I believe the open and diverse dialogue in a competitive media is very important to my ability to decide for myself who I wish to vote for or how I feel about a wide range of topics. Please do not vote to change the broadcast ownership rules. Keep the public airwaves PUBLIC!

Sincerely, Rachel L. Schultz. 62 years old

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: IrishTomJ@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:24 PM
Subject: (no subject)

I am very concerned about the removal of certain restrictions pertaining to the ownership of media. I strongly feel the changes will limit access by the public to more diverse opinions and possibly narrow the scope of ideas being offered. I ask that you reconsider some of these regulations. Honestly-- look at the public outcry over this, there must be something to this. You are, after all, there to protect the interests of the public and not necessarily those of the large corporate entities. Tom Jeffers, Chico, CA

From: Joe Mangan
To: Commissioner Adelstein, kjweb@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:31 PM
Subject: Fw: Foxes managing the Chicken Coop!!!!(sorry about the other message)

Oops I goofed below is what you should have received!!!!

----- Original Message -----

From: Joe Mangan
To: jadelste@fcc.gov ; kjmweb@fcc.gov ; mcopps@fcc.gov ; kabernat@fcc.gov ; mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Sunday, June 01, 2003 9:10 AM
Subject: RE: Foxes managing the Chicken Coop!!!!

Dear sir;

I am a concerned citizen. I watch with amazement as the Chairman dodge question after question on ABC's news show this morning about the changes to the FCC rules regulating ownership of stations. I was also amazed at his adamant statement that the changes were going to be nominal. Another concern lest you forget Mr. Powell the air ways are owned by the American people not some rich, ego and agenda driven station owner.

I'm pretty sure based on the past history that my choices of radio and TV stations; not currently subscribing to cable are going to be minimized. As an example as I drive to Los Angeles, California the type and number of stations has been lowered with the quality of the radio stations going down too. There already has been an impact on what is reported in the news, Disney censored an article that Mr. Eisner decided was not in Disney's best interest on TV. If the other stations hadn't covered the articles he decided were not in his companies best interest I wouldn't have known about the material. I have one question Mr. Powell, "Why did you go to the stations and ask them to buy off on this change?" and not the American people. Is it possible that your lining up for your job after you and the commissioners leave office? You had to solicit support as I read it from the small stations to medium stations and was said that resulted in some changing their minds to allow for the change.

I'm pretty sure you like bland uninteresting radio like that put out by the satellite companies but in the shrinking world I like regional quality radio and TV. Not what is being put out by

the monopolistic, my way or the no way, vanilla flavorings of the owners. Their attitude is in my way of thinking, "I know what is best for you listeners" agenda.

As fewer owners talking to their friends in government gets smaller and smaller the result is going to be slanted, censored, and minimalist news coverage with result that the regime in power remains in power. As an example, only after Iraq fell did we learn that President Bush and his advisors have lied to us about Weapons of Mass Destruction and the regime within Iraq. One more salient point every time someone says its in the best interest of me the listening public, I have lost. More news all the time is the result. Another result when is the last time you could tune into a country and western station or classical music station in some areas of the United States, hmmm? I don't listen to these two musical styles often but I want them as choices and I don't want to be listening to the crapola put out by the ever shrinking radio and TV stations.

Here comes what my brother calls my liberal rant! I have a feeling under the governing of Adolf Hitler's government as time went on and the communications within the country was taken over by the governing board known as the Nazi's the rant, albeit total lies about "the Jewish problem" on radio increased due to Adolf's needs to deal with the issue within his country Propaganda and one viewpoint editorials are not in the best interest of the American people. You seem to forget slanting the news brings out the fruits and nuts, that bomb the oppositions places of business, churches and homes. Sound familiar, unless I miss my guess, Adolf, Stalin and Lenin had their equivalent FCC people allow for similar reductions of ownership, till the state ended up owning the stations. The question I have is how this differ from what your organization is proposing? Fewer and fewer owners. fewer and fewer points of view, fewer and fewer ideas, and fewer and fewer options the result being NAZI Germany here in the USA. I don't like the POV (point of view), that I see forthcoming from the TV and radio stations in my area.

I don't like the idea that McCarthyism is on the rise. But then again I see the glass as half empty. I am attaching a letter written to the Senators here in California, hopefully it will pass through your virus scanners software. It didn't make it through my virus scan so I've put the letter

below!

By the way if you don't see a problem in going to the radio and television owners asking them about, "would you like to bigger", then I have problem with your mind set.

Thanks much;

Joseph M. Mangan
Home: 925 455 6630
Cell: 925 980 3975
Email: jomangan@earthlink.net

jomangan@earthlink.net

Sorry the attachment didn't take so here's what was ent to my Seantors and my Representative in California. I have also edited the above document better.

Dear representative;

What's wrong with the following two pictures.

The SEC is responsible for the playing field in the NYSE and other securities venues in the USA. When recently have they done anything for the stockholders, other than for the high roller big stockholders or corporations? Also how many companies have gone down in flames while they(SEC) stood on the sidelines after some decision they made in error or by listening to the foxes in the board room!

Next item on the list is the FCC! Unless I miss my guess the airwaves belong to the people of the USA not the people who own the radio and TV stations. My feeling is the head of the FCC is asking the larger owners of hundreds and the smaller owners to go along with limiting what I as an American perceive as "freedom of speech". The number of stations owned by the bigger owners is going up unless something id done.

How many more Rush Limbaugh stations is it going to take before you my representatives go "hmmm?" the information being disseminated is decidedly one sided as in to liberal or in my case feeling its to conservative. PBS hopefully will still turn out shows like POV and other unslanted communications to people who think. I rest my case with the Dixie Chicks and Danny Glover brouhaha. My 1st, 2nd and I believe 14th amendment

rights thanks to the FCC, Homeland Security and the DSEA are disappearing rapidly.

For right now take a look at the FCC and the SEC and fix these to problems if

you will, at a later date and time I will address other issues!

Having just recently watched the CBS show on Hitler a question arises, is this how

the Nazi's came to power? With only the parties information being disseminated

along the lines of what I see and hear as I travel in these here United States maybe

I should be concerned. The rhetoric after 911 from the conservatives left some

people concerned about our rights under the Constitution.

Thanks much

Joseph M. Mangan

Home: 925 455 6630

Cell: 925 980 3975

Email: jomangan@earthlink.net

jomangan@earthlink.net

From: William F. Simonds
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:31 PM
Subject: Stop Media Deregulation Rule Change June 2

Dear FCC Chairman Commissioners,
Democracy thrives on healthy, pluralistic discourse. We need to preserve the diversity of media voices in the U.S. and protect the smaller players in this field from large media conglomerates with monopolistic and anti-competitive urges. Please protect diversity and balance in local media markets by not adopting the rule change on June 2.

Sincerely,
William F. Simonds
11902 Smoketree Rd.
Potomac, MD 20854-3461

From: Jim Brasunas
To: Tony Brasunas, Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:35 PM
Subject: RE: Media Deregulation

Mr. Powell,

I couldn't agree with my son's request more. I am very concerned that the media that our nation is exposed to is becoming more narrow, rather than broader.

I just returned from a trip to Europe (Ireland), and couldn't help noticing even in remote areas, TV carries not only CNN, but news and views from the Irish networks, British networks and Continental sources. This variety of views is very healthy and leads to a population that is more highly attuned to the issues of the day.

Media has such a major impact on all facets of our lives. Let's increase the diversity, not narrow it.

Thanks for your consideration,
Jim Brasunas

-----Original Message-----

From: Tony Brasunas [mailto:tony@garlicandgrass.org]
Sent: Sat 5/31/2003 6:02 AM
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Cc: kabernat@fcc.gov, mcopps@fcc.gov; kjmweb@fcc.gov; jadelste@fcc.gov
Subject: Media Deregulation

Honorable Mr. Powell:

For the love of God and all that is beautiful and true in the world, consider putting off the vote on this massive media deregulation at least until July, when people will have had a real chance to learn about the salient issues on both sides of this issue. Is it not important to consider that this might be a fabulously un-democratic decision, if it goes ahead? Honestly, of the thousands of public comments you have recently received, how many have supported going ahead now?

In a democracy, the people's will counts. Please uphold our democracy.

Sincerely,

Tony Brasunas

===== <> =====
Tony Brasunas
Publisher
Garlic & Grass
A Grassroots Journal of America's Political Soul
www.garlicandgrass.org
tony@garlicandgrass.org

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Sue James
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:39 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

NO, to deregulation of media!!!
Sue James
7327 SW Barnes Rd #125
Portland, OR 97225